

SIG Form 1–Application Cover Sheet

**School Improvement Grant (SIG)
Application for Funding**

**APPLICATION RECEIPT DEADLINE
July 2, 2010, 4 p.m.**

Submit to:
California Department of Education
District and School Improvement Division
Regional Coordination and Support Office
1430 N Street, Suite 6208
Sacramento, CA 95814

NOTE: Please print or type all information.

County Name: Kern County		County/District Code: 15-63768
Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name Semitropic School District		LEA NCES Number: 0636330
LEA Address 25300 Hwy. 46		
City Wasco		Zip Code 93280
Name of Primary Grant Coordinator Bryan Caples		Grant Coordinator Title Superintendent
Telephone Number 661-758-6412	Fax Number 661-758-4134	E-mail Address brcaple@zeus.kern.org
CERTIFICATION/ASSURANCE SECTION: As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I have read all assurances, certifications, terms, and conditions associated with the federal SIG program; and I agree to comply with all requirements as a condition of funding. I certify that all applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed and that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct and complete.		
Printed Name of Superintendent or Designee Dr. Bryan L. Caples		Telephone Number 661-758-6412
Superintendent or Designee Signature		Date 8/30/10

Collaborative Signatures: The SIG program is to be designed, implemented, and sustained through a collaborative organizational structure that may include students, parents, representatives of participating LEAs and school sites, the local governing board, and private and/or public external technical assistance and support providers. Each member should indicate whether they support the intent of this application.

[illegible]

SIG Form 2–Collaborative Signatures (page 2 of 2)

School District Approval: The LEA Superintendent must be in agreement with the intent of this application.

CDS Code	School District Name	Printed Name of Superintendent	Signature of Superintendent
15-63768	Semtiropic School District	Dr. Bryan L. Caples	
CERTIFICATION AND DESIGNATION OF APPLICANT AGENCY			

Applicant must agree to follow all fiscal reporting and auditing standards required by the SIG application, federal and state funding, legal, and legislative mandates.

LEA Name:	Semitropic Elementary School
Authorized Executive:	Dr. Bryan L. Caples
Signature of Authorized Executive	

Effective/beneficial for all students. The average score for each model was as follows...

Transformation Model (4.0 Points)

Turnaround Model (1)

Restart Model (0)

School Closure Model (0)

After further discussion team unanimously chose the transformation model because it was simply the best “fit” for our student population. School Closure was never an option since we are a one school district. The turnaround model was not chosen because members of the team did not think that “firing” good teachers was a viable option for staff morale and effectiveness. The restart model was not chosen because the members of the team believed that it was not feasible to implement it in the given timeline.

The next task of the transformation team was to assess the capacity of the district and school to support the transformation model and make sure its implementation would be successful. The transformation team was provided with all information on what the district staff and elementary school can do to promote rapid and successful academic improvement . The transformation team unanimously decided that with the proper funding the district and school has the capacity to successfully implement the transformation model.

The transformation team used the Academic Performance Survey (APS), CST results, local academic multiple measures (writing samples, reading fluency scores, quarterly benchmark scores for math and Language Arts, etc.) to assess the needs of the school. The transformation team chose these three measures because they believe that the three measures give adequate and informative information to help the team decide what strategies to implement during the transformation period to ensure academic success for all students.

The transformation team met at least once (more than once for some groups) with members from the school site council, ELAC, parent club, and parent Migrant education school advisory committee. All findings, etc., were shared with each group and thoughtful discussions took place. Ultimately, all groups unanimously agreed with

the transformation team's findings and its decision to implement the transformation model at the school.

The findings of the transformation team include...

1. The school does not provide enough instructional time during the regular school day for students.
2. Teachers have limited instructional support.
3. The school does not provide students with the current State Board of Education (SBE)-adopted, standards-based, basic core instructional programs and materials in Reading/ Language Arts (RLA)/English language development (ELD), including ancillary materials for universal access.
4. The school does not provide a RLA/ELD intensive intervention program in grades four through eight (RLA/ELD intervention program was cut in the 2008-2009 school year due to budget cuts).
5. The school does not provide a mathematics intervention program and materials in grades four through eight.
6. The school has not provided the principal with a 40-hour administrative training, Module I in leadership, support and monitoring needed for the full implementation of the SBE-adopted RLA/ELD basic core and intervention program materials in use at the school through a knowledgeable, experienced provider. The principal has not completed a 40-hour structured practicum based on the implementation of the instructional materials and the EPCs.
7. All teachers have not completed a 40-hour instructional materials professional development program provided by a knowledgeable and experienced provider for the SBE-adopted RLA/ELD and/or SBE-adopted intensive intervention instructional program in use at the school and an 80-hour structured practicum based on the implementation of the instructional materials and the EPCs.
8. All teachers have not completed a 40-hour instructional materials professional development program provided by a knowledgeable and experienced provider for the SBE-adopted Math and/or SBE-adopted intensive intervention instructional program in use at the school and an 80-hour structured practicum based on the implementation of the instructional materials and the EPCs.
9. The school does not provide instructional assistance and ongoing support to all teachers of RLA/ELD and intensive intervention. The school no longer has an ELA academic coach due to budget cuts (since the 2008-2009 school year).

10. The school does not provide instructional assistance and ongoing support to all teachers of Math and intensive intervention. The school/district does not have a math coach.

11. The school needs an assessment and monitoring system that provides timely data from common assessments based on the SBE-adopted RLA/ELD/Math and intensive intervention programs.

12. The school does not have an adequate library building or an adequately equipped library (the school library is housed in a make-shift building that is approx. 10 ft. wide and 20 ft. long. The library has approx. 400 books for 260 students).

13. The school lacks the proper technology to adequately teach students. The school has a computer lab that has only 12 working computers. All 12 computers are outdated and have inadequate software. The classrooms have an average of two computers in them for student use. Those computers are also outdated and have inadequate software. All classrooms have projectors, but 80% of them need Smart Boards, etc.

14. The school does not have a parent training program to teach parents how to help their students achieve academic success.

15. The school does not offer before/after school tutoring to help students that are struggling academically in ELA and math.

16. The school does not provide a comprehensive summer school program for all students.

17. The school does not provide pre-school services to ensure that all students are ready to attend and succeed in kindergarten.

18. The school does not have an adequate amount of space (buildings) to adequately house all of its students, etc.

19. The school does not provide full day kindergarten classes to ensure that all kindergarteners are ready for first grade.

20. The school does not provide teacher incentive bonuses for excellent teachers.

21. The school does not provide incentives to retain highly qualified teachers.

22. The school does not have an academic Learning Director to help implement the transformation model (the school has a part-time principal – 10%).

ii. Selection of Intervention Models

The first task of the transformation team was to decide which model to implement. The team leader (superintendent) presented each of the models to the team and each team member was asked to provide the pros and cons of each model. A likert scale (1-5) was used by each team member to determine which model they thought would be most effective and beneficial for all students. The average score for each model was as follows...

Transformational Model (4.0 Points)

Turnaround Model (1.0)

Restart Model (0)

School Closure Model (0)

After further discussion team unanimously chose the transformational model because it was simply the best “fit” for our student population. School Closure was never an option since we are a one school district. The turnaround model was not chosen because members of the team did not think that “firing” good teachers was a viable option for staff morale and effectiveness. The restart model was not chosen because the members of the team believed that it was not feasible to implement it in the given timeline.

iii. Demonstration of Capacity to Implement Selected Intervention Models

Response:

The transformation team assessed the capacity of the district and school to support the transformation model and make sure its implementation would be successful. The transformation team was provided with all information on what the district staff and elementary school can do to promote rapid and successful academic improvement . The transformation team unanimously decided that with the proper funding the district and school has the capacity to successfully implement the transformation model.

With the help of SIG funds the LEA has the capacity to...

1. Work with an Outside Provider for Transformation Implementation

2. Provide Training/In-Services for Teachers
3. Hire an ELA Intervention Teacher
4. Hire a ELL Intervention Teacher
5. Provide After School Tutoring for ELA and Math
6. Provide Saturday School Tutoring for ELA and Math
7. Provide Summer School for ELA and Math
8. Provide Parent Trainings
9. Provide Training for Site Administrator (AB 430)
10. Lengthen the School Year by Five Days

Without the help of SIG funds the school has the capacity to...

1. Lengthen the school day by 20 Minutes

iv. Recruitment, Screening, and Selection of External Providers

Response:

The transformation team took several steps to select an external provider for the school. First, a list of potential providers was identified by the team. The team identified five potential providers. The team requested each of the five providers to submit a proposal for services for the 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013, school years. The team developed a qualification criterion to ensure that the most qualified and competent provider was chosen. Each qualification component was equally weighted.

The selection criterion was as follows...

1. A provider that will help develop effective school leadership (20%).
2. A provider that will help the school develop formative assessments to understand

student learning and guide instruction (20%).

3. A provider that will incorporate targeted, ongoing professional development to ensure instructional quality and best teaching practices (20%).

4. A provider that will help create dramatic and rapid academic improvement and student success (20%).

5. A provider with a proven “track record” of helping schools succeed (20%).

All potential providers were rated by each team member using a five point likert scale (a score of 5 being the highest). After scores were given by team members all scores were added up and the “top” two providers were identified. The “top” provider was given a score of 90%, and the next second highest was given a score of 80%. The team then debated the “pros and cons” of both service providers and unanimously selected a provider.

The team shared their findings with the Migrant parent committee, ELAC, and the site council committee. All committees unanimously agreed that the most effective provider was chosen.

The LEA is currently negotiating a contract with WestEd to be its transformation model provider.

v. Alignment of Other Resources with the Selected Intervention Models

Response:

The LEA has identified several other resources it will use to help implement the Transformation model. These resources include...

1. Migrant Education

The school will use \$15,000 from its Migrant Education program for before/after school tutoring services in math and ELA.

2. Rural Education – (REAP)

The school will use \$20,000 from its REAP program to hire highly qualified classroom aides to provide support for math and ELA for “at-risk” students.

3. Title I

The school will use \$5,000 from its Title I program to provide access to teacher training and in-services based on effective instructional strategies for teaching math and ELA.

4. English Language Learner (ELL)

The school will use \$10,000 to purchase appropriate technology for academic use by students (computers, software, hardware, etc.).

6. Economic Impact Aide (EIA)

The school will use \$10,000 from its EIA program to purchase library books for its school library.

The transformation team unanimously agreed the resources above are imperative to the success of our students.

vi. Alignment of Proposed SIG Activities with Current DAIT Process (if applicable)

Response:

N/A

vii. Modification of LEA Practices or Policies

Response:

To fully implement the Transformational model the school will have to modify a number of its current practices and/or policies. The transformation team agreed that the following modifications/practices are necessary to fully implement the transformational model...

1. The LEA will hire an outside provider to help implement the transformation model.
2. The school principal will be replaced (2010-2011)
3. A revised teacher/administrator evaluation system will be implemented that takes into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement .
4. Teachers and administrators that do not fully implement the model will be Identified and removed after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice.
5. Data will be used to identify and implement instructional programs that are research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with California's adopted academic content standards.

6. Site and district administrators will conduct periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if deemed ineffective

7. Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other state or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs

8. The site principal will be given sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes.

9. Lengthen the school day by a minimum of 20 minutes

Rationale: Lengthening the school day by 20 minutes provides an extra 50 hours of instruction during the course of the year.

10. Require the teaching staff to attend a minimum of 80 hours of staff development (reading, ELA, and/or math) each school year.

Rationale: The teaching staff must be "up to date" on the latest research based instructional strategies .

11. Require the principal to attend a minimum of 80 hours of staff development (reading, ELA, and/or math) each school year.

Rationale: The principal has not taken AB430 and must be trained in the use and implementation of our ELA and math programs.

12. Require the teaching staff to attend grade level collaboration meetings for a minimum of one hour each week.

Rationale: Research demonstrates that teachers need to collaborate to discuss data, assessments, goals, share best practices, etc., with each other, etc.

13. Lengthen the school year by five full days.

Rationale: Lengthening the school year by five full days will provide an extra 30 hours of instruction for all students.

The transformation team solicited input from teachers, administrators, parents, and site committees (Site Council, ELAC, Migrant Parent Committee, etc.). All stakeholders agreed that these modifications/practices were essential for the success of the transformational model.

viii. Sustainment of the Reforms after the Funding Period Ends

Response:

The LEA intends to implement a waiver to extend the SIG funding through September

30, 2013.

The LEA has identified four resources that will enable it to sustain the selected intervention model after the expiration of the SIG funding period.

1. The LEA will hire a part-time grant writer/trainer to prepare proposals and grant applications to help provide the financial resources to help sustain the transformation model. The grant writer will research, identify, and develop grant opportunities in the areas of education and educational technology. As well as prepare and write grants for the SIG funding period, the grant writer will train school administrators and staff members in the effective procedures of locating grant opportunities and preparing grant proposals after the SIG funding ends. Projected funding = \$250,000 per year.
2. After the expiration of the SIG funding the LEA will use the majority of its categorical funding (Migrant, ELL, EIA, Title I, Title II, etc.), to continue to implement the transformation model. Projected funding = \$300,000 per year.
3. The LEA will work with local school districts to consolidate resources (sharing academic coaches, sharing resources, staff development programs, transportation, special education, etc.). The LEA has identified four local school districts that are interested in consolidating resources. Consolidating resources will enable the LEA to continue the transformational model at a much more cost effective rate. Projected savings = \$160,000 per year.
4. The LEA has been devastated by the financial problems of the state of California. The LEA has lost approx \$350,000 per year over the past few years. Once the state is financially able to meet its financial obligations to the LEA that money will be used to continue the effective implementation of the transformation model. Projected funding = \$350,000 per year.

Total projected funding/savings = \$1,060,000 per year to help continue implementation of transformation model after SIG funding ends.

ix. Establishment of Challenging LEA Annual School Goals for Student Achievement

Response:

The LEA has established annual goals for student achievement on the state's CST assessments in both reading/language arts (RLA) and mathematics.

They are as follows...

1. Reduce the percentage of students that are non-proficient in ELA by 5% as measured by state CST scores (AYP).

2. Reduce the percentage of students that are non-proficient in math by 5% as measured by state CST scores (AYP).

3. Score at a minimum of 5 points higher on the Academic Performance Index (API).

4. 70% of all regular education students demonstrate positive academic gains (a minimum of one year growth) on local standards based benchmarks (reading fluency, mathematics, and ELA) during the course of the academic year.

5. 70% of English language learners gain at least one full level (beginning to early intermediate, intermediate to early advanced, etc.) during the course of the school year.

The district superintendent and site principal will be responsible for monitoring all goals.

The progress of goals one and two will be monitored quarterly by using local standards based ELA and math benchmarks and annually using the CST scores.

The progress of goal three will be monitored quarterly using local standards based benchmarks in ELA and math and annually when the API scores is determined by the state office of education.

The progress of goal four will be monitored quarterly using local standards based benchmarks ELA and math assessments.

The progress of goal five will be monitored annually when the CELDT scores have been determined by the state office of education.

All data collected will be used to determine if current academic practices are effective and/or need to be revised to meet the needs of students. The data will be used to determine which staff development programs to initiate, set short and long term goals, identify students that need remediation in ELA and/or math, identify areas of subject matter competencies in teachers and students.

x. Inclusion of Tier III Schools (if applicable)

x. Serving Tier III Schools (if applicable)

N/A

xi. Consultation with Relevant Stakeholders

Response:

Upon becoming eligible for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) the district superintendent and school Board decided to appoint a district transformation team to

decide if the school had the capacity to implement one of the SIG models and to decide which model to use. The team was made up from a group of stakeholders that includes

representatives from the LEA (district superintendent), elementary school (principal, teachers, and classified staff), parents (site council parents, ELAC parents, etc.) and community members (local business owners).

Throughout the process the transformation team consulted all stakeholder groups regarding their findings and recommendations. All stakeholder input was incorporated in this application. No stakeholder input was rejected for the purposes of this application.

SIG Form 4a–LEA Projected Budget

LEA Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2010–11

Name of LEA: Semitropic School District	
County/District (CD) Code: 15-63768	
County: Kern	
LEA Contact: Dr. Bryan L. Caples	Telephone Number: 661-364-7779
E-Mail: brcaple@zeus.kern.org	Fax Number: 661-758-4134
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000– 1999	Certificated Personnel Salaries	570,750	570,750	570,750
2000– 2999	Classified Personnel Salaries	128,000	128,000	128,000
3000– 3999	Employee Benefits	107,000	107,000	107,000
4000– 4999	Books and Supplies	159,800	159,800	159,800
5000– 5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures	313,782	313,782	313,782
6000–	Capital Outlay			

6999				
7310 & 7350	Indirect Costs	54,002	54,000	54,000
Total Amount Budgeted		\$1,333,334	\$1,333,333	\$1,333,333

SIG Form 4b—School Projected Budget

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2010–11

Name of School: Semitropic Elementary School	
County/District/School (CDS) Code: 15-63768	
LEA: Semitropic School District	
LEA Contact: Dr. Bryan L. Caples	Telephone Number: 661-364-7779
E-Mail: brcaple@zeus.kern.org	Fax Number: 661-758-4134
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000–1999	Certificated Personnel Salaries			
	DISTRICT IS A ONE SCHOOL DISTRICT – EVERYTHING WAS PUT ON LEA SECTION			
2000–2999	Classified Personnel Salaries			
3000–3999	Employee Benefits			

4000–	Books and Supplies			
4999				
5000–	Services and Other Operating			
5999	Expenditures			
6000–	Capital Outlay			
6999				
7370 &	Transfers of Direct Support Costs			
7380				
Total Amount Budgeted				

Budget Narrative Instructions

Instructions for Completing Budget Narrative

Use the LEA and school budget narrative forms to describe the costs associated with each activity reflected in the budget. Please include both school and district level budget forms. A general description of activities and their corresponding range of object codes are provided below. See the complete list of object codes on page 41.

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Object Codes</u>
For all personnel, include number of full-time equivalent (FTE) employees, number of days, rate of pay, etc., and a brief description of the duties/services to be performed.	1000–2999
Benefit costs charged to this program must be proportionate to the salary charged to the program. Costs for PERS reduction must be identified separately.	3000–3999
Costs for instructional materials and other materials/office supplies must be identified separately. Provide examples of what will be purchased or other justification. For example, general office supplies at \$100 per month x 20 months = \$2,000.	4000–4999
Each expense must be listed separately with the costs broken out. Identify costs for rental of meeting facilities (when justified), rental of equipment, equipment repair, etc. For all instructional consultant contracts/services include FTE, number of days, rate of pay, etc., and a brief description of the duties/services to be performed. Costs must be broken out and detail must be provided describing how the expenditure supports the School restructuring plan.	5000–5999
Capital outlay costs are allowable under this sub-grant. Please provide detail describing how the expenditure supports the action plan.	6000–6999

SIG Form 5a–LEA Budget Narrative

LEA Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the LEA budget. The LEA budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include LEA budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
1. Outside Provider to Help Implement Trans. Model	\$220,282	5100
2. Training for Teachers for ELA, math, technology, etc. (approx. five 8hr. days each) – 10 Teachers X \$1,500 each for training + \$1,000 each for Hotel and Per Diem + \$125 Per Day Substitute Pay = \$31,250	\$31,250	5200
3. ELA Academic Coach/ELA Intervention Teacher - \$60,000 salary + \$20,000 for Insurance/Benefits	\$80,000	1900/ 3101/
4. ELL Academic Coach/ELL Intervention Teacher - \$60,000 salary + \$20,000 for Insurance/Benefits	\$80,000	1900
5. After School Tutoring (Focus on Math/ELA) – 180 days for 45 min. each day X 10 teachers (@ \$40 per hour) = \$300 per day X 180 days = \$54,000	\$54,000	1100
6. Supplies (pencils, paper, etc.) for After School Tutoring – 180 days X 100 students X \$25 each = \$2,500	\$2,500	4300
7. Saturday School Tutoring (Focus on Math/ELA) – 10 days for 180 min. each day X 10 teachers (@ \$40 per hour) = \$1200 per day X 10 days = \$12,000	\$12,000	1100

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
8. Supplies for Saturday School Tutoring (100 students X \$10 each = \$1000)	\$1,000	4300
9. Summer School Tutoring (Focus on Math/ELA) – 20 days for 180 min. each day X 10 teachers (@ \$40 per hour) = \$1200 per day X 20 days = \$24,000	\$24,000	1100
10. Parent Trainings – 10 parent trainings (to teach strategies to help them help their students in reading, ELA, and mathematics) @ \$250 per training for supplies, teacher stipends, etc.) = \$2,500	\$2,500	1100
11. Summer School Supplies – 100 students X \$20 per student = \$2,000	\$2,000	4300
12. Library Books – 260 Students X 15 books each 3900 books @ \$10 each = \$39,000	\$39,000	4200
13. Academic Data Collection Software - \$7,500 yr. + \$2,500 for training = \$10,000 \$10,000	\$10,000	5100
14. Computers – 32 Computers for On-Site Computer Lab @ \$900 each = \$28,800	\$28,800	4400
15. Classroom Computers – 3 for each classroom X 9 classrooms @ \$900 each = \$24,300	\$24,300	4400
16. Full Day Kindergarten Class – One half-day salary for extended day kindergarten teacher = \$30,000 + \$12,000 for insurance and benefits	\$42,000	1100/ 3101/ 3401
17. Smart Board for Classrooms – 8 classrooms X \$1,500 each for Smart Board + \$300 for each mount + \$450 for Hardware + \$400 for labor = \$21,200	\$21,200	4400
18. Staff/Administrator Bonuses for Making Academic Progress (10% of annual salary) = 9 regular education teachers + 2 intervention teachers + 7 aides + 1 principal + 1 superintendent = 20 X 10% = \$120,000	\$120,000	1100/ 1300
19. Study Island (Online California Content Standards Mastery Program for K-8 students for Math, Reading ELA, Science, History/SS) \$5,500 for all K-8 classrooms.	\$5,500	5100
18. Lengthen the school year five days (Certificated Teacher Salaries)	\$30,000	1100

SIG Form 5a–LEA Budget Narrative

LEA Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the LEA budget. The LEA budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include LEA budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
21. AB 430 Training for Site Administrator (Modules 1, 2, and 3 = 80 Hours) = \$3,000	\$3,000	5200
22. Portable Computer Lab – 32 computers @ \$1,100 each + \$1,500 for portable cart + \$100 for wireless connections in 12 classrooms = \$37,900	\$37,900	4400
23. Library Manager Software - \$3,100 first year - \$800 thereafter	\$3,100	4400
24. Grant Writer/Trainer	\$50,000	5100
25. 5 Highly Qualified Part-Time Aides (\$20,000 each) for Supplemental Reading and Math Instruction + Benefits of \$30,000	\$130,000	2100/ 3402
26. Academic Learning Director to Help Implement Transitional Model = \$80,000 Salary + \$25,000 Benefits = \$105,000	\$105,000	1900/ 3101/ 3401
27. Salary Bonuses to Retain Highly Qualified Staff (10% of annual salary) = 9 regular education teachers + 3 intervention teachers + 7 aides + 1 principal + 1 superintendent = 20 X 10% = \$120,000	\$120,000	1100
Revised June 17, 2010		49

SIG Form 5b—School Budget Narrative

School Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the school budget. The school budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

School Name:

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
SINCE THE SCHOOL IS A ONE SCHOOL DISTRICT		
WE PUT ALL EXPENDITURES ON THE LEA SHEET		

Object of Expenditure Codes

School districts and county superintendents of schools are required to report expenditures in accordance with the object classification plan in the California School Accounting Manual. The use of these object codes will facilitate the preparation of budgets and the various financial reports requested by federal, state, county, and local agencies. The California School Accounting Manual is available from the CDE Publication Sales (call 1-800-995-4099).

1000–1999 Certificated Personnel Salaries

- 1100 Certificated Teachers' Salaries
- 1200 Certificated Pupil Support Salaries
- 1300 Certificated Supervisors' and Administrators' Salaries
- 1900 Other Certificated Salaries

2000–2999 Classified Personnel Salaries

- 2100 Classified Instructional Salaries
- 2200 Classified Support Salaries
- 2300 Classified Supervisors' and Administrators' Salaries
- 2400 Clerical, Technical, and Office Staff Salaries
- 2900 Other Classified Salaries

3000–3999 Employee Benefits

- 3101 State Teachers' Retirement System, certificated positions
- 3102 State Teachers' Retirement System, classified positions
- 3201 Public Employees' Retirement System, certificated positions
- 3202 Public Employees' Retirement System, classified positions
- 3301 OASDI/Medicare/Alternative, certificated positions
- 3302 OASDI/Medicare/Alternative, classified positions
- 3401 Health and Welfare Benefits, certificated positions
- 3402 Health and Welfare Benefits, classified positions
- 3501 State Unemployment Insurance, certificated positions
- 3502 State Unemployment Insurance, classified positions
- 3601 Workers' Compensation Insurance, certificated positions
- 3602 Workers' Compensation Insurance, classified positions
- 3701 OPEB, Allocated, certificated positions
- 3702 OPEB, Allocated, classified positions
- 3751 OPEB, Active Employees, certificated positions
- 3752 OPEB, Active Employees, classified positions
- 3801 PERS Reduction, certificated positions
- 3802 PERS Reduction, classified positions
- 3901 Other Benefits, certificated positions
- 3902 Other Benefits, classified positions

4000–4999 Books and Supplies

- 4100 Approved Textbooks and Core Curricula Materials
- 4200 Books and Other Reference Materials
- 4300 Materials and Supplies
- 4400 Noncapitalized Equipment
- 4700 Food

5000–5999 Services and Other Operating Expenditures

- 5100 Subagreements for Services
- 5200 Travel and Conferences
- 5300 Dues and Memberships
- 5400 Insurance

5000–5999 Services and Other

5500 Operations and Housekeeping Services
5600 Rentals, Leases, Repairs, and Noncapitalized Improvements
5700–5799 Transfers of Direct Costs
5710 Transfers of Direct Costs
5750 Transfers of Direct Costs—Interfund
5800 Professional/Consulting Services and Operating Expenditures
5900 Communications

6000–6999 Capital Outlay

6100 Land
6170 Land Improvements
6200 Buildings and Improvements of Buildings
6300 Books and Media for New School Libraries or Major Expansion of School Libraries
6400 Equipment
6500 Equipment Replacement
6900 Depreciation Expense (for proprietary and fiduciary funds only)

7000–7499 Other Outgo

7100–7199 Tuition

7110 Tuition for Instruction Under Interdistrict Attendance Agreements
7130 State Special Schools
7141 Other Tuition, Excess Costs, and/or Deficit Payments to Districts or Charter Schools
7142 Other Tuition, Excess Costs, and/or Deficit Payments to County Offices
7143 Other Tuition, Excess Costs, and/or Deficit Payments to JPAs

7200–7299 Interagency Transfers Out

7211 Transfers of Pass-Through Revenues to Districts or Charter Schools
7212 Transfers of Pass-Through Revenues to County Offices
7213 Transfers of Pass-Through Revenues to JPAs
7221 Transfers of Apportionments to Districts or Charter Schools
7222 Transfers of Apportionments to County Offices
7223 Transfers of Apportionments to JPAs
7281 All Other Transfers to Districts or Charter Schools
7282 All Other Transfers to County Offices
7283 All Other Transfers to JPAs
7299 All Other Transfers Out to All Others

7300–7399 Transfers of Indirect Costs (Effective 2008-09)

7310 Transfers of Indirect Costs
7350 Transfers of Indirect Costs—Interfund
7370 Transfers of Direct Support Costs (Valid through 2007-08)
7380 Transfers of Direct Support Costs—Interfund (Valid through 2007-08)

7430–7439 Debt Service

7432 State School Building Repayments
7433 Bond Redemptions
7434 Bond Interest and Other Service Charges
7435 Repayment of State School Building Fund Aid—Proceeds from Bonds
7436 Payments to Original District for Acquisition of Property
7438 Debt Service—Interest
7439 Other Debt Service—Principal

SIG Form 6—General Assurances and Certifications

General Assurances (Required for all Applicants)

Note: All sub-grantees are required to retain on file a copy of these assurances for your records and for audit purposes. Please download the General Assurances form at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/>. Your agency should **not** submit this form to the CDE.

Certifications Regarding Drug-Free Workplace, Lobbying, and Debarment and Suspension

Download the following three forms from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/>, and obtain the necessary signatures and include the original forms with your application submission.

1. Drug-Free Workplace
2. Lobbying
3. Debarment and Suspension

SIG Form 7–Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances (page 1 of 3)

Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances

As a condition of the receipt of funds under this sub-grant program, the applicant agrees to comply with the following Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances:

1. Use its SIG to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements of SIG;
2. Establish challenging annual goals for student achievement on the state's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds;
3. If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
4. Report to the CDE the school-level data as described in this RFA.
5. The applicant will ensure that the identified strategies and related activities are incorporated in the revised LEA Plan and Single Plan for Student Achievement.
6. The applicant will follow all fiscal reporting and auditing standards required by the CDE.
7. The applicant will participate in a statewide evaluation process as determined by the SEA and provide all required information on a timely basis.
8. The applicant will respond to any additional surveys or other methods of data collection that may be required for the full sub-grant period.
9. The applicant will use funds only for allowable costs during the sub-grant period.
10. The application will include all required forms signed by the LEA Superintendent or designee.
11. The applicant will use fiscal control and fund accountability procedures to ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, federal funds paid under the sub-grant, including the use of the federal funds to supplement, and not supplant, state and local funds, and maintenance of effort (20 USC § 8891).

SIG Form 7–Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances (page 2 of 3)

12. The applicant hereby expresses its full understanding that not meeting all SIG requirements will result in the termination of SIG funding.
13. The applicant will ensure that funds are spent as indicated in the sub-grant proposal and agree that funds will be used **only** in the school(s) identified in the LEA's AO-400 sub-grant award letter.
14. All audits of financial statements will be conducted in accordance with Government Auditing Standards (GAS) and with policies, procedures, and guidelines established by the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), Single Audit Act Amendments, and OMB Circular A-133.
15. The applicant will ensure that expenditures are consistent with the federal Education Department Guidelines Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) under Title 34 Education. <http://www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.html> (Outside Source)
16. The applicant agrees that the SEA has the right to intervene, renegotiate the sub-grant, and/or cancel the sub-grant if the sub-grant recipient fails to comply with sub-grant requirements.
17. The applicant will cooperate with any site visitations conducted by representatives of the state or regional consortia for the purpose of monitoring sub-grant implementation and expenditures, and will provide all requested documentation to the SEA personnel in a timely manner.
18. The applicant will repay any funds which have been determined through a federal or state audit resolution process to have been misspent, misapplied, or otherwise not properly accounted for, and further agrees to pay any collection fees that may subsequently be imposed by the federal and/or state government.
19. The applicant will administer the activities funded by this sub-grant in such a manner so as to be consistent with California's adopted academic content standards.
20. The applicant will obligate all sub-grant funds by the end date of the sub-grant award period or re-pay any funding received, but not obligated, as well as any interest earned over one-hundred dollars on the funds.
21. The applicant will maintain fiscal procedures to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of the funds from the CDE and disbursement.

SIG Form 7–Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances (page 3 of 3)

22. The applicant will comply with the reporting requirements and submit any required report forms by the due dates specified.

I hereby certify that the agency identified below will comply with all sub-grant conditions and assurances described in items 1 through 22 above.

Agency Name:	Semitropic School District
Authorized Executive:	Dr. Bryan L. Caples
Signature of Authorized Executive	

SIG Form 8–Waivers Requested

Waivers Requested

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement (see page 28 for additional information). If the LEA does not intend to implement a waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which school(s) it will implement the waiver on:

- ☐ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the LEA to September 30, 2013.

Note: If the SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs receiving SIG funds.

- ☐ “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit the LEA to allow its Tier I and Tier II schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to “start over” in the school improvement timeline. (**Note:** This waiver applies to Tier I and Tier II schools only)

- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit the LEA to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II school that does not meet the poverty threshold. (**Note:** This waiver applies to Tier I and Tier II schools only)

SIG Form 9—Schools to Be Served

Schools to be Served

Indicate which schools the LEA commits to serve, their Tier, and the intervention model the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school. For each school, indicate which waiver(s) will be implemented at each school. **Note:** An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools can only use the transformation model in 50 percent or less of those schools. (Attach as many sheets as necessary.)

SCHOOL NAME	CDS Code	NCES Code	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)				WAIVER(S) TO BE IMPLEMENTED		PROJECTED COST
						Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation	Start Over	Implement SWP	
Semitropic Elementary School	15-63768	0636330	X						X			\$4,000,000

SIG Form 10–Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School

Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School

Complete this form for each identified Tier I and Tier II school the LEA intends to serve. List the intervention model to be implemented. Include the required component acronym, actions and activities required to implement the model, a timeline with specific dates of implementation, the projected cost of the identified activity, the personnel and material federal, local, private and other district resources necessary, and the position (and person, if known) responsible for oversight.

School: _____ Tier: I or II (circle one)						
Intervention Model: <input type="checkbox"/> Turnaround <input type="checkbox"/> Restart <input type="checkbox"/> Closure <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transformation						
Total FTE required: _____ LEA _____ School _____ Other						
Required Component Acronym	Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs School LEA		Resources	Oversight

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)
Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: Semitropic Elementary School					
Intervention Model: <input type="checkbox"/> Turnaround <input type="checkbox"/> Restart <input type="checkbox"/> Closure <input type="checkbox"/> Transformation					
<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____					
Total FTE required: _____ LEA _____ School _____ Other _____					
Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs School LEA		Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
Replace School Principal	By 8/18/2010	One School District	0	N/A	Dist. Sup.
Hire Outside Provider	When SIG Funding Approved	"	\$220,282	N/A	Dist. Sup.
Order All Materials and Supplies	When SIG Funding Approved	"	\$159,800	Migrant, ELL, EIA	Site Principal
Hire Certificated Personnel	When SIG Funding Approved	"	\$570,750	N/A	Dist. Sup.
Hire Classified Personnel	When SIG Funding Approved	"	\$128,000	Migrant, ELL, EIA	Dist. Sup
Hire Grant Writer/Trainer	When SIG Funding Approved	"	\$50,000	N/A	Dist. Sup
Begin Parent Training	September 2010	"	2,500	Migrant	Site Principal

AB 430 Training for Principal	When SIG Funding Approved	“	\$3,000	Title II	Dist. Sup.
Begin After School Tutoring	Aug. 2010	“	\$54,000	Migrant	Site Principal
Begin Saturday School Tutoring	Aug. 2010	“	\$10,000	Migrant	Site Principal
Extend School Year by 5 Days	June 1011	“	\$30,000	N/A	Dist. Sup
Provide Summer School	June 2011	“	\$24,000	Migrant	Site Principal

Appendix A: SIG Rubric

School Improvement Sub-grants Application Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
i. Needs Analysis LEA describes the process and findings of the needs assessment conducted on each school it commits to serve and the evidence used to select the intervention model to be implemented at each school. The description includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessment instruments used • LEA and school personnel involved • process for analyzing findings and selecting the intervention model • findings on use of state-adopted standards-aligned materials and interventions 	<p>The narrative includes a thorough and complete overview of the process used to assess schools, including specific instruments used, and multiple data elements cited.</p> <p>The narrative identifies a variety of qualified LEA, school, parents, and community stakeholders providing a range of perspectives involved in collecting and analyzing school data.</p> <p>The narrative describes a specific and effective process for analyzing assessment findings, including meetings of appropriate LEA and school personnel and school advisory groups to review the findings and provide input on the needs analysis.</p>	<p>The narrative includes a general overview of the process used to assess schools, including specific instruments used, and multiple data elements cited.</p> <p>The narrative identifies LEA, school, and community stakeholders involved in collecting and analyzing school data, with a description of their level of involvement.</p> <p>The narrative describes a process for analyzing assessment findings, including a basic description of how LEA and school personnel and school advisory groups reviewed the findings and provided input.</p>	<p>The narrative includes limited information on the process used to assess schools, including specific instruments used, and multiple sources cited.</p> <p>The narrative does not identify appropriate LEA, school, and community stakeholders involved in collecting and analyzing school data.</p> <p>The narrative does not sufficiently describe a process for analyzing assessment findings.</p>

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ curriculum pacing and instructional time ○ Amount and types of staff PD, collaboration, and instructional support ○ use of student data, alignment of resources, and staff effectiveness 	The narrative includes discrete and specific findings concerning all of the areas listed in the RFA that led to the selection of the intervention.	The narrative includes basic findings concerning all of the areas listed in the RFA that led to the selection of the intervention	The narrative does not include findings concerning all of the areas listed in the RFA that led to the selection of the intervention.
ii. Selection of Intervention Model The LEA's rationale for its selection of the intervention model for each school is stated clearly and is correlated to the needs analysis for that school.	<p>The narrative reflects a logical and well organized process for selecting the intervention model. The rationale for the selection demonstrates a solid connection between assessment results, findings of current practice, and staff effectiveness in the selection the intervention model.</p> <p>All areas of the needs analysis are discussed and linked coherently to the selected intervention, providing clear evidence that the selection is appropriate for the school.</p> <p>The narrative provides specific data from a variety of sources that explicitly supports the selection of the intervention model.</p>	<p>The narrative describes a basic process for selecting the intervention model. The rationale demonstrates a connection between assessment results, findings of current practice, and staff effectiveness in the selection the intervention model.</p> <p>All areas of the needs analysis are discussed and linked to the selected intervention.</p> <p>The narrative provides data points from several sources to support the selection of the intervention model.</p>	<p>The rationale reflects some sense of organization, but omits significant links to the needs analysis.</p> <p>Few of the needs analysis areas are discussed and/or there is little apparent correlation with the selected intervention.</p> <p>The rationale is supported by a small number of data areas and from few sources with limited specificity.</p>

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>iii. Demonstration of capacity to implement selected intervention models</p> <p>a. The LEA demonstrates its capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model(s) it has selected.</p> <p>b. Although not required, when an LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, it must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school. If the limitation is at the LEA level then the LEA must identify the specific barriers that preclude serving all of its Tier I schools. If the limitation is based on conditions at a specific school or schools, then the LEA must describe those conditions. If there are additional limiting factors, please describe them.</p>	<p>a. The LEA fully describes how it will use SIG funding and all other available resources required to implement the intervention model selected. The narrative includes extensive information on the specific use of each resource to support implementation of the planned school improvement activities.</p> <p>The description demonstrates that the LEA has fully identified the resource needs of each school and appropriately planned how resources will be used to achieve successful implementation of all activities planned for each school.</p> <p>b. The LEA identifies the specific barriers that preclude serving all of its Tier I schools, and provides clear and substantial evidence of the existence of those barriers</p>	<p>a. The LEA describes how it will use SIG funding to implement the intervention model selected. The narrative includes general information on how resources will be used to support implementation of the planned school improvement activities.</p> <p>The description demonstrates that the LEA has considered the differing resource needs of each school in determining how SIG funding and other LEA resources will be used to address the specific needs of each school and lead to successful implementation.</p> <p>b. The LEA identifies the specific barriers that preclude serving all of its Tier I schools, and provides evidence of the existence of those barriers.</p>	<p>a. The LEA provides a limited description of how it will use SIG funding to implement the intervention model selected. The narrative includes little or no information on how other resources will be used to support implementation of the planned school improvement activities.</p> <p>The description does not adequately demonstrate that the LEA has considered the differing resource needs at each school in determining how SIG funding and other LEA resources will be used to address the specific needs of each school and lead to successful implementation.</p> <p>b. The LEA marginally identifies barriers that preclude serving all of its Tier I schools, and provides limited or no evidence of the existence of those barriers.</p>

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>iv. Recruitment, screening, and selection of external providers (if applicable)</p> <p>Although not required, when the LEA intends to use external entities to provide technical assistance in selecting, developing, and implementing one of the four models, it must describe its process for ensuring their quality. The LEA describes the process that will be undertaken to recruit, screen, and select external providers including specific criteria such as experience, qualifications, and record of effectiveness in providing support for school improvement.</p>	<p>An LEA intending to use an external entity to provide technical assistance describes specific, appropriate qualifications (including experience, qualifications, and record of effectiveness in providing support for school improvement) that the LEA will require prospective providers to meet.</p> <p>The narrative describes a coherent, rigorous process that the LEA will conduct in reviewing prospective providers to ensure that they meet the LEA's qualifications.</p> <p>The LEA also describes, in detail, the specific process that it will use in the selection of its external support providers from all prospective providers that meet the LEA's qualification criteria, including the specific actions and personnel involved in the selection process.</p>	<p>An LEA intending to use an external entity to provide technical assistance describes specific qualifications (including experience, qualifications, and record of effectiveness in providing support for school improvement) that the LEA will require prospective providers to meet.</p> <p>The narrative describes a process for reviewing prospective providers to ensure that they meet the LEA's qualifications.</p> <p>The LEA also describes, in general, the process that it will use to select its external support providers from all prospective providers that meet the LEA's qualification criteria, including specific actions involved in the selection process.</p>	<p>An LEA intending to use an external entity to provide technical assistance does not adequately describe specific qualifications that the LEA will require prospective providers to meet.</p> <p>The narrative does not adequately describe the process to be used in reviewing prospective providers to ensure that they meet those qualifications.</p> <p>The LEA does not adequately describe the process that it will use to select its external support providers from all prospective providers that meet the LEA's qualification criteria.</p>

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
v. Align other resources with the interventions The LEA identifies all resources that are currently available to the school(s) that will be used to support implementation of the selected intervention model. The LEA identifies other federal, state, LEA and/or private funding sources including other district resources the LEA will use to support SIG implementation. Examples of funds the LEA should consider include, but are not limited to: Title II, Part A funds used for recruiting high-quality teachers; or Title III, Part A funds which could be used to improve English proficiency of English learner students, and categorical block grant funds used for instructional materials and professional development.	The LEA explicitly identifies a number of other resources planned for use in implementing the selected school intervention models, and fully describes how these resources will support SIG implementation. The other resources identified clearly align with the LEA's needs analysis for each school and logically and appropriately support the implementation plan for each school.	The LEA identifies other resources planned for use in implementing selected school intervention models and describes how these resources will support SIG implementation. The other resources identified align with the LEA's needs analysis for each school and clearly support the implementation plan for each school.	The LEA has identified few, if any, resources planned for use in implementing selected school intervention models. The other resources identified minimally align with the LEA's needs analysis and lack specificity and coherence with the implementation plan for each school.

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>vi. Align Proposed SIG Activities with Current DAIT Process (if applicable)</p> <p>For LEAs currently participating in the District Assistance and Intervention Team (DAIT) process, the LEA must describe how it will coordinate its DAIT work and its SIG work around the lowest-achieving schools. The description must identify the major LEA improvement actions adopted from the DAIT recommendations and describe how the LEA has aligned its proposed SIG activities with of those major LEA improvement actions.</p>	<p>The LEA provides a thorough and comprehensive description of how it will coordinate DAIT recommendations and activities identified in the LEA plan with the planned SIG implementation activities for each school.</p> <p>The narrative provides information developed through the DAIT process to inform the selection of the intervention model(s) selected for each school.</p>	<p>The LEA provides a general description of how it will coordinate DAIT recommendations and activities identified in the LEA plan with the planned SIG implementation activities for each school.</p>	<p>The LEA provides little or no description of how it will coordinate DAIT recommendations and activities identified in the LEA plan with the planned SIG implementation activities for each school.</p>

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>vii. Modify LEA Practices or Policies</p> <p>Depending on the intervention model selected, the LEA may need to revise some of its current policies and practices to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. These may include, but are not limited to, collective bargaining agreements, the distribution of resources among schools, parental involvement policies, school attendance areas and enrollment policies, and agreements with charter organizations.</p> <p>If the LEA anticipates the need to modify any of its current practices or policies in order to fully implement the selected intervention model(s), identify and describe which policies and practices need to be revised, the process for revision, and a description of the proposed revision.</p>	<p>The LEA has fully developed and described in detail a comprehensive plan to modify any and all current practices or policies in order to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model(s).</p> <p>The plan fully and clearly describes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Which policies or practices will be revised 2) The rationale for their selection 3) The process for revision (that includes input from key stakeholders, including parents and collective bargaining units) 4) A description of the proposed revision and expected outcome 	<p>The LEA has developed and generally described a plan to modify practices or policies in order to fully implement the selected intervention model(s).</p> <p>The plan includes a description of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Which policies or practices will be revised 2) The process for revision that includes input from stakeholders 3) A description of the proposed revision and expected outcome 	<p>The LEA has not sufficiently developed or described a plan to modify current practices or policies in order to fully implement the selected intervention model(s).</p> <p>The plan does not sufficiently describe:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Which policies or practices will be revised 2) The process for revision 3) A description of the intended revision and expected outcome

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>viii. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends</p> <p>SIG funding provided through this application must be expended by September 30, 2011, unless the LEA intends to implement a waiver to extend the funding through September 30, 2013. The LEA must state whether it intends to implement a waiver to extend the funding period and identify the resources that will be used to sustain the selected intervention after the SIG funding period expires.</p>	<p>The LEA indicates whether it intends to implement a waiver to extend the funding through September 30, 2013.</p> <p>The LEA has provided a clear and comprehensive plan for use of resources other than SIG funds to sustain selected intervention models and activities following expiration of the SIG funding period.</p>	<p>The LEA indicates whether it intends to implement a waiver to extend the funding through September 30, 2013.</p> <p>The LEA has provided a basic plan for use of resources other than SIG funds to sustain selected intervention models and activities following expiration of the SIG funding period.</p>	<p>The LEA may or may not indicate whether it intends to implement a waiver to extend the funding through September 30, 2013.</p> <p>The LEA has not provided a complete plan for use of resources other than SIG funds to sustain selected intervention models and activities following expiration of the SIG funding period.</p>

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>ix. Annual Goals for Student Achievement</p> <p>The LEA has established annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts (RLA) and mathematics that it will use to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve.</p> <p>Examples may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making one year's progress in RLA and mathematics • Reducing the percentage of students who are non-proficient by 10% or more from the prior year • For students who are two or more years below grade level, accelerating their progress at a rate of two years academic growth in one school year <p>Or meeting the LEA's goals established in the State's Race to the Top application</p>	<p>The annual goals for student achievement are measurable, are based on the state's assessments in RLA and mathematics, and are clearly identified for each school that the LEA commits to serve.</p> <p>The goals are realistic and reflect high expectations for improved student achievement, and are based on the needs of each school.</p> <p>The plan for monitoring the identified goals is clearly described, includes specific timelines and procedures, and identifies the personnel responsible for its implementation.</p>	<p>The annual goals for student achievement are measurable, are based on the state's assessments in RLA and mathematics, and are generally identified for each school that the LEA commits to serve.</p> <p>The goals are realistic, project improved student achievement, and are based on the needs of each school.</p> <p>The plan for monitoring the identified goals is described and includes clear implementation procedures.</p>	<p>The annual goals for student achievement are not sufficiently identified for each school that the LEA commits to serve.</p> <p>The goals appear limited, project a minimal increase in student achievement, and/or are not based on the needs of each school.</p> <p>The plan for monitoring the identified goals is inadequate or is not provided.</p>

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>x. Serving Tier III Schools (if applicable)</p> <p>If applicable, the LEA has described services and activities that benefit each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve.</p>	<p>The LEA has clearly described services and activities that benefit each Tier III school.</p> <p>The LEA has clearly described activities that reflect a direct, tangible, and substantial benefit to each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve.</p> <p>The LEA has provided references to verify that the services and activities are research based. The selected services and activities are clearly designed to meet the individual needs of each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve.</p>	<p>The LEA has generally described services and activities that benefit each Tier III school.</p> <p>The LEA has generally described activities that reflect a direct, tangible, benefit to each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve.</p>	<p>The LEA has not sufficiently described services and activities that benefit each Tier III school.</p> <p>The LEA has not clearly described activities that reflect a direct, tangible, benefit to each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve.</p>

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>xi. Consultation with relevant stakeholders</p> <p>The LEA has described its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders, including parents, regarding the LEA's application and solicited their input for the development and implementation of school improvement models in its participating Tier I and Tier II schools.</p> <p>Examples may include local board meetings, parent meetings, School Site Council meetings, school and/or district English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC), district advisory committee, and local bargaining unit meetings which indicate discussion of the LEA's application.</p>	<p>The LEA clearly identifies its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application.</p> <p>The LEA's description demonstrates comprehensive consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application, including local board meetings, parent meetings, School Site Council meetings, school and/or district English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC), district advisory committee, and local bargaining unit meetings.</p> <p>The LEA has provided minutes and agendas of meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's SIG application that recount the input obtained.</p>	<p>The LEA identifies a general process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application.</p> <p>The LEA's description demonstrates consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application, including parents and other stakeholders.</p> <p>The LEA has described meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's SIG application, including a description of key stakeholder input that was incorporated in the LEA's SIG application.</p>	<p>The LEA does not clearly identify its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application.</p> <p>The LEA's description does not adequately demonstrate consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application.</p> <p>The LEA has not sufficiently described meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's SIG application.</p>

Rubric – LEA SIG Application

SIG Narrative Element	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
xi. Consultation with relevant stakeholders (cont.) The LEA identifies which stakeholder recommendations have been used in the development of the LEA's SIG have been used in the development of the LEA's SIG implementation plan, and discusses stakeholder input not accepted, including a rationale for rejecting that input.	The LEA has identified all significant stakeholder input, identifies input incorporated in the SIG implementation plan, discusses rejected input and provides a rationale for each rejected suggestion.	The LEA has identified significant stakeholder input, identifies input incorporated in the SIG plan, and provides a rationale for each rejected suggestion.	The LEA has not sufficiently identified significant stakeholder input; noted input incorporated in the SIG plan, or provided a rationale for each rejected suggestion.

Other SIG Application Components	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>Implementation Chart(s)</p> <p>The LEA 's Implementation Chart(s) include actions and activities required to implement all aspects of the selected intervention model.</p> <p>The actions and activities listed are aligned with the needs analysis for the school.</p> <p>The costs of actions and activities listed are identified in the Projected Cost column</p> <p>A timeline of implementation is provided.</p> <p>The individual(s) who will be responsible for oversight and monitoring are indicated.</p>	<p>The actions and activities are clearly stated, reasonable, research-based, and contain all required elements of the selected intervention model, including those that are already being implemented, and includes some permissible activities.</p> <p>The actions and activities listed are realistic and clearly aligned with the needs analysis of the school. The description includes references to specific aspects of the needs analysis.</p> <p>The costs of actions and activities listed are identified clearly and realistically based on current LEA costs and financial practices.</p> <p>The timeline is detailed, clear, contains specific dates, and the pacing appears to be brisk but reasonable.</p> <p>The individual(s) responsible for oversight are clearly indicated. The distribution of responsibility is reasonable and realistic.</p>	<p>The actions and activities are reasonable and contain all required elements of the selected intervention model, including those already being implemented. Activities reflect strategies likely to increase student achievement.</p> <p>The actions and activities listed are aligned with the needs analysis of the school.</p> <p>The costs of actions and activities listed are identified and are generally aligned with current LEA costs and financial practices.</p> <p>The timeline is clear and the pacing appears to be appropriate.</p> <p>The individual(s) responsible for oversight are indicated.</p>	<p>The actions and activities are not clearly stated, may be unreasonable, and/or do not contain all required elements of the selected intervention model. Activities reflect strategies unlikely to increase student achievement</p> <p>The actions and activities listed are unrealistic and/or are not clearly aligned with the needs analysis of the school.</p> <p>The costs of actions and activities listed are not fully identified and/or do not appear to be generally aligned with current LEA costs and financial practices.</p> <p>The timeline is not clear, does not contain specific dates, and/or the pacing appears unreasonable</p> <p>The individual(s) responsible for oversight are not clearly indicated.</p>

Other SIG Application Components	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>Budgets</p> <p>The LEA projected budget is complete.</p> <p>The LEA budget narrative is complete.</p> <p>The school projected budget(s) are complete.</p>	<p>The LEA projected budget is complete, expenditures are accurately classified by object code, the full term of the grant is covered, and totals by year are provided.</p> <p>The LEA budget narrative includes detailed information to describe LEA activities and costs associated with each object code. Budget items accurately reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other LEA activities described for each participating school are included.</p> <p>The school projected budget(s) are complete, expenditures are accurately classified by object code, the full term of the grant is covered, and totals by year are provided.</p>	<p>The LEA projected budget is complete; expenditures are appropriately listed for the full term of the grant and totals by year are provided.</p> <p>The LEA budget narrative includes general information to describe LEA activities and costs associated with each object code. Budget items generally reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other LEA activities described for each participating school are included.</p> <p>The school projected budget(s) are complete; expenditures are appropriately listed for the full term of the grant, and totals by year are provided.</p>	<p>The LEA projected budget is incomplete, expenditures are not accurately classified by object code, or the full term of the grant is not covered.</p> <p>The LEA budget narrative includes little information to describe LEA activities and costs associated with each object code. Budget items do not reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and/or other LEA activities described for each participating school are not included.</p> <p>The school projected budget(s) are incomplete, expenditures are not accurately classified by object code, the full term of the grant is not covered, and/or totals by year are not provided.</p>

Other SIG Application Components	Strong (2 points)	Adequate (1 point)	Inadequate (0 points)
<p>Budgets (cont.)</p> <p>The school budget narrative(s) are complete.</p> <p>The school and LEA budget(s) are aligned.</p>	<p>The school budget narrative(s) include detailed information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Budget items accurately reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school are included.</p> <p>The LEA and school budgets are clearly aligned and, taken together, fully describe appropriate expenditures of funds in all categories that are clearly sufficient to support the design, implementation and ongoing maintenance of the proposed SIG activities. The proposed expenditures reflect research-based strategies likely to increase student achievement.</p>	<p>The school budget narrative(s) include general information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Budget items generally reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school are included.</p> <p>The LEA and school budgets are aligned and, taken together, adequately describe expenditures of funds in all categories of the proposed SIG activities. The proposed expenditures reflect strategies likely to increase student achievement.</p>	<p>The school budget narrative(s) include little information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Budget items do not reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and/or other activities described for each participating school are not included</p> <p>The LEA and school budgets are not clearly aligned, the LEA has not sufficiently described expenditures of funds in categories necessary to support proposed SIG activities, and/or proposed expenditures reflect strategies unlikely to increase student achievement</p>
<p>Collaborative signatures</p>	<p>The information on collaborative partners clearly indicates support of the SIG plan by the LEA and each participating school, parents, school advisory groups, the local bargaining unit, and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>The information on collaborative partners indicates support of the SIG plan by the LEA and participating stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>The information on collaborative partners indicates little, if any, support of the SIG plan by the LEA and participating stakeholder groups.</p>

Appendix B: School Improvement Grant Model Component Acronyms

Use the following acronyms to correlate your responses in the implementation charts with the model components.

Turnaround model:

Replace the principal and grant the new principal sufficient operational flexibility. (RP)

Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent, and select new staff. (SS)

Implement strategies that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff. (RPR)

Provide staff ongoing job-embedded professional development. (PD)

Adopt a new governance structure. (GS)

Use data to identify and implement a new instructional program. (IP)

Promote the continuous use of student data. (SD)

Provide increased learning time. (ILT)

Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services. (SCO)

Transformation model:

Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformed model. (RP)

Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals. (ES)

Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so. (IRR)

Provide staff ongoing job-embedded professional development. (PD)

Implement strategies that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff. (RPR)

Use data to identify and implement a new instructional program. (IP)

Promote the continuous use of student data. (SD)

Provide increased learning time. (ILT)

Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement. (FCE)

Give the school sufficient operational flexibility. (OF)

Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization. (TA)

Restart model

Select a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a locally-determined rigorous review process. (SO)

Submit charter application to CDE (if applicable). (SCA)

Plan for or enter into contract with EMO. (CEMO)

Enroll any former student who wishes to attend the school. (ES)

Closure model

Decision reached to close school. (CS)

Enroll the students who attended the closed school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. (OSE)

Ensure other schools are within proximity to the closed school. (CP)

Appendix C: School Improvement Grant Information Resources

LETTERS

Letter to Chief State School Officers – January 15, 2010

This letter announces the interim final requirements and the updated state application package for the School Improvement Grants program [PDF](#)

Letter to Chief State School Officers – December 2, 2009

This [letter](#) announces the final requirements and the state application package for the School Improvement Grants program.

NOTICES

Interim Final Requirements – January 15, 2010 [MS Word](#)

This document contains the interim final requirements governing the process that a State educational agency (SEA) uses to award school improvement funds authorized under section 1003 (g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act To local educational agencies (LEAs) in order to transform school culture and substantially raise the achievement of students attending the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools, including secondary schools. The official version will be posted in the U.S. Federal Register.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 – January 20, 2010 [MS Word](#)

Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants as Amended in January 2010 – January 28, 2010 [MS Word](#)

APPLICATION

SEA Application – January 15, 2010 [MSWord](#)

OTHER SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT RESOURCES

Academic Program Survey (APS)

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/vl/improvttools.asp#aps>

Profiles of successful California schools

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/vl/improvingschls.asp>

California *Education Code* (EC)

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/calaw.html>

District Assistance Survey (DAS)

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/vl/documents/distassistsrvy.doc>

English Learner Subgroup Self-Assessment (ELSSA)

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/documents/t3elssa09.xls>

Essential Program Components

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/vl/essentialcomp.asp>

Indirect Cost Rates

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/ic>

Inventory of Services and Supports (ISS) for Students with Disabilities

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/documents/isswdtool.doc>

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Self-Assessment

<http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/pj/204>

Single Plan for Student Achievement

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/nclb/sr/le/documents/spsaguide.doc>

The Regional Educational Laboratories (RELs)

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/>

Center on Instruction

<http://www.centeroninstruction.org/>

A collection of scientifically based research and information on K-12 instruction in reading, math, science, special education, and English language learning. Part of the Comprehensive Center network, the Center on Instruction is one of five content centers serving as resources for the 16 regional U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Centers. This resource provides links for topic-based materials, syntheses of recent research, and exemplars of best practices.

What Works Clearinghouse

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>

Established in 2002, the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) is a central and trusted source of scientific evidence for what works in education.

An initiative of the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences, the WWC:

- Produces user-friendly [practice guides](#) for educators that address instructional challenges with research-based recommendations for schools and classrooms;
- Assesses the rigor of research evidence on the effectiveness of [interventions](#) (programs, products, practices, and policies), giving educators the tools to make informed decisions;
- Develops and implements [standards](#) for reviewing and synthesizing education research; and
 - Provides a public and easily accessible [registry of education evaluation researchers](#) to assist schools, school districts, and program developers with designing and carrying out rigorous evaluations.